PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—Sir, I lay on the Table Notification No. HD 54 TMT 59, dated 2nd September 1959 issued under clause (*b*) of sub-section (1) of Section 16 of the Mysore Vehicles Taxation Act, 1957.

MYSORE HEREDITARY VILLAGE OFFICES ABOLITION BILL, 1959.

(*Introduction.*)

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, I beg to introduce the Mysore Hereditary Village Offices Abolition Bill, 1959.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Mysore Hereditary Village Offices Abolition Bill, 1959 is introduced.

Motion re. payment of an additional amount of Rs. 100 a month to Members of the Legislative Assembly and providing for free medical aid to the members of their family.

Sri SHARAN GOWDA (Jewargi).—Sir, I move:

"That the present salary of Rs. 150 per mensem given to members of the Mysore Legislature being inadequate to meet the reasonable expenditure for carrying out their duties, this Assembly recommends to Government to take necessary action to amend the existing legislation and provide for payment of an additional amount of Rs. 100 a month and also to provide for free medical aid to the members of their family."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the present salary of Rs. 150 per mensem given to members of the Mysore Legislature being inadequate to meet the reasonable expenditure for carrying out their duties, this Assembly recommends to Government to take necessary action to amend the existing legislation and provide for payment of an additional amount of Rs. 100 a month and also to provide for free medical aid to the members of their family."

†ಶ್ರೀ ಶರಣಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಗೊತ್ತುವಳಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣವನ್ನು ಬೇಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಅದು ಹಾಗೇನೂ ಅಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಸ್ವಾಲರಿ ಅಲ್ಲ. ನೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬ ಸಂದೇಹವಿರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ತಂತಮ್ಮ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿರುಗಾಡಲು, ಉಳಿದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಲು ಈಗಿನ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಖರ್ಚು ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಅನೇಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಮೈಸೂರು ಸ್ಟೇಟಿನಲ್ಲಾ ರೈಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಓಡಾಡಲು "ಫ್ರೀ ಪಾಸ್"ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆಬಂದಿತ್ತು. ಅದರ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಯಾವ ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನಗನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಟೇಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಬಸ್ಸುಗಳು ನ್ಯಾಷನಲೈಜ್ ಆಗಿದೆ ಅಂತಹ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂ. ಎಲ್. ಎ. ಗಳಾಗಿರುವವರು ಓಡಾಡಲು ಮತ್ತು ಅವರ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಓಡಾಡಲು ಫ್ರೀ ಪಾಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಸೂಚನೆಯಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅದನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ವರೆಗೂ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಗಮನಿಸಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನಗನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತನೆ ದಿವಸ ನಾನು ಈ ಗೊತ್ತುವಳಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ತಮ್ಮ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಿರುಗಾಡಲು ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಒಂದು ಟ್ರಾವಲಿಂಗ್ ಅಲೋಯನ್ಸಿನ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ನೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಯಾವ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳೂ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸಂಗತಿ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಜನರನ್ನು ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಭೇಟಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳು ಬಂದು ಪಾಸಾಗಿ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಾಗುತ್ತಿವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಎಷ್ಟೋ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಗಳು ಆಗುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಇವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಜಾಗೃತಿಯನ್ನುಂಟು ಮಾಡುವ ನಲುವಾಗಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಿರುಗಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಜನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾಗೃತಿಯಾಗಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ತಿರುಗಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ತಿರುಗಾಡಲು ಯಾವ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಬಸ್ಸುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಫ್ರೀ ಪಾಸನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸರಕಾರವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಲಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯ ವರೆಗೂ ಸರಕಾರ ಯಾವ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಗೊತ್ತುವಳಿಯನ್ನು ಸರಕಾರದ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ಒಂದು ನೂರು

ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಟ್ರಾವಲಿಂಗ್ ಅಲೋಯನ್ಸಿನ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಲು ನಮ್ಮ ಈಗಿನ ಲೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಚರಿನ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಲು ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತೆ ನಾನು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಒರಿಜಿನಲ್ ರೆನಲೂಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಅಲೊಯನ್ಸನ್ನು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು 1ನೆಯ ಜನವರಿ 1959 ರಿಂದ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿರುವ ರೆನಲೂಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಕೈ ಬಿಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಡಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನೀವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಮೆಂಡು ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಓದಿನೋಡಿ.

"Rs. 100 as T. A." ಎಂದಲ್ಲ. ಕೊಡುವಂತಹ ಸಂಬಳ ಅವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಡಮೆಯಾದುದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ನೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ತಾವು "T.A. per month" ಎಂದು ಹಾಕಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಅಮೆಂಡು ಮಾಡುವ ತರಹದಲ್ಲದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಶರಣಗೌಡ.—ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ Free Medical Aid ನ ವಿಚಾರವಿದೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಸೆಷನ್ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ Free Medical Aid ಎಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಿಂದ ಹೊರಗೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ಅಥವಾ ತಿರುಗಾಡುವಾಗ ಆಗಲಿ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅನಾರೋಗ್ಯವಾದರೆ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ಸಹಾಯವೂ ಈಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಹೀಗೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಹೋಗುವಾಗ ಅವರ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಿರುಗಾಡಲು ಸಹಾಯವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ Free Medical Aid provide ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನನಗನಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಂದು ಈ ಗೊತ್ತುವಳಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ತಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಯೋಗ್ಯ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ನನ್ನ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ನಾಗೂರ (ಬಿಜಾಪುರ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ಗೊತ್ತುವಳಿಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸಂತೋಷದಿಂದ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತ ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಎರಡೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್‌ರವರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿ ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೂ 1,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಪಗಾರ ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಎಂ. ಎಲ್. ಎ. ಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ನೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದಿದ್ದರೆ ಯಾರೂ ಅದನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚೆನ್ನುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಒಂದು ನೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳೇ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ; ತಮ್ಮ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಲಿಕ್ಕೆ T. A., ಬೇರೆ ಏಕೆ! ಇದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದರು.

ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಲು ಬೇರೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಕೆಲವು ಜನರೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವ ಜನರಿಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಎಂ. ಎಲ್. ಎ. ಗಳು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಲು ಸಮರ್ಥನಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಜನ ಪೂರಾ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮನುಷ್ಯರಿರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಎಂ. ಎಲ್. ಎ. ಅವರನು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡ್ಡಾಡಿ ನಮ್ಮ ವಿಧಾನ ಸೌಧಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಸರಿಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎನ್ನಬಹುದು. ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಹೇಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ, ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡ್ಡಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ನೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮಾಹೆಯಾನ 250 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಂಧ್ರದಲ್ಲೂ ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ 250 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪಂಜಾಬಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಹೆಯಾನ 300 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರೇನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಜನರ ಹಿತ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಹೆಚ್ಚೇನಲ್ಲ; ಇದನ್ನು ಸಂತೋಷದಿಂದ ಸ್ವಾಗತ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಬೆಂಬಲ ನೀಡುತ್ತಾರೆನ್ನುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಸಂಶಯವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ನನ್ನ ಈ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY (Coondapur).—Sir, I should like to say a few words on this very delicate motion. This is a motion which as, we know, is likely to be misunderstood also. To be frank, it required a lot of thinking to speak on the motion. To be honest also is dangerous in politics.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE (Chikodi).—Not ultimately correct.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—I have seen these things being criticised in the press. Even educated people have been criticising these things. Any demand for an increase of salary by legislators is always misunderstood, whether deserved or undeserved. I should say that Legislators in India get the lowest salary in the world. It is well-known. We heard the speech by the Chairman, Legislative Council, yesterday in the Vidhana Soudha. He gave us a picture of the conditions that prevail in Australia. I have read something about these things in America where a Senator is paid very high salary. He is allotted a budget to run his office, to appoint a Secretary and a clerk and that it was open scandal in a majority of cases the Secretary was his own wife; and the clerk was his own son. It is still a scandal there. We are much better than that. To say that is one thing and to act is

(SRI V. SRINIVAS SHETTY)

another. I was wondering how this Resolution could have come from this side. This agitation for increase in salary has been going on for the last two years in the party sitting on the other side. I read in the newspapers that the Congress Legislature Party had already come to a decision and that they had resolved that the salary ought to be enhanced. Therefore, there is a baby already, but the father is unwilling to own parentage (*Laughter*). We know who the parents are, but they do not come forward to openly acknowledge their parenthood. In the normal course, I would have welcomed this resolution. The straightforward thing to do would have been for the ruling party to have sponsored the resolution.

I am rather taken aback as to how this resolution could find a place at all in the agenda yesterday, which is supposed to be devoted purely to official business. That resolution should have crept in only with the consent of the Government. We know what fate non-official resolutions suffer at the hands of Government and it is inconceivable that this Resolution would have come before the House without official blessing. I am not opposed to the resolution as such. I only say that the ruling party should have proceeded with the business in a more honest way. I admit that we deserve more, whatever the people at large may say. people are bound to view suspiciously any attempt at increase of pay or allowances to members of the Legislature. But I am not worried as to what people at large may say, as long as we honestly feel the need for the increase. That the salary is the lowest in India is an accepted fact. There have been proposals in the past for increase or grant of this or that allowance and we are accustomed to being treated with a bill from the Government. Why this special treatment for this matter? I do not know how this is going to be implemented, even if it should be passed by the House. We had tabled a resolution some time back to fix the salary of Government servants at a minimum of Rs. 100 and a maximum of Rs. 1000. That resolution was not passed in the House and unless the ruling party agrees to the present resolution, this too would suffer the same fate.

MR. SPEAKER.—Of course, the Member has every right to make political capital out of it, but as an impartial person, I would ask him whether he agrees with the resolution or not?

SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—If we oppose the resolution, does it amount to our making political capital? Should each and every criticism be born out of political desires?. The choice of the words is not happy, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER.—I have made myself clear. I did not say that Sri Srinivasa shetty was in fact making political capital. I only said that he might make political capital.

SRI V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—I am sorry that the Chair made such a remark but I am glad that the Chair did not actually mean it.

MR. SPEAKER.—I did not say that the Member did make political capital.

SRI V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Why then was the word used at all? I personally wish that nobody makes political capital out of it.

MR. SPEAKER.—That is very good.

SRI V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—If the ruling party had been convinced of the issue, they should have come forward. We have not demanded an increase. At least from my side, we have not demanded it. When the ruling party has decided to do a certain thing, why do they foist it on us? Therefore it is not we on this side who are trying to exploit a situation. It is the other side which is afraid to wound but willing to strike. (*Laughter*). If the ruling party is really anxious to increase the salary, it is their duty...

SRI F. X. DENIS PINTO (Kaup).—I rise to a point of order. Are we not here to discuss the merits of the resolution? Is it relevant to have a lengthy discussion as to who brought the resolution?

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member has a right to make such

remarks. I do not think his remarks are out of the way.

Sri MAHMOOD SHARIFF (Broadway). Is not my friend playing hide and seek ? He says that he is not opposed to the principle contained in the resolution.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Members have a right to play hide and seek. (*Laughter*).

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—My friend has misunderstood me. I did not say that I would not welcome the resolution. I only said that Sri Sharangowda should not have brought the Bill. He would not have brougth it before the House unless he was instigated or supported by the ruling party. We know that with the present strength of the opposition, the resolution would not see the light of the day. Let us understand the position. My point is: let not the other side exploit the situation for political purposes.

Sri MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—Is it open to the Hon'ble Member to cast aspersions on another member by saying that he was instigated ?

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—No aspersion was cast. I said 'Let it not be said that the Opposition brought the resolution'. When the word 'political exploitation' was used I wanted it to be clearly understood that we did not do it. It is the Government, the ruling party, which is really anxious to bring in the resolution. We may support or we may oppose.....

Sri B.D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—How is it that the Hon'ble the Leader of the Opposition is entering into a discussion on the intentions of the ruling party ? I cannot understand him. The ruling party has not expressed any intention...

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—The ruling party's intention is published...

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Then you talk about the publication, but it is not the ruling party's opinion.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—Since the Hon'ble the Chief Minister has interfered, may I know as to when this particular resolution was tabled by the Hon'ble Member who has moved it, and whether it has been given precedence in the ballot ? There are so many other resolutions which have not come before the House. Under what rule has this resolution been moved and is it proper ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will find out from the records and inform the Hon'ble Member.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—The Hon'ble the Chief Minister was pleased to ask how the intention of his party was made known to us. I will confess I read about it in the newspapers. I may be wrong. The papers may be wrong. If it is wrong, I may be told so and I would stand corrected.

Sir, as I stated earlier, I am not opposing the principle of raising the salary. A certain amount of increase is necessary. I am one of those who always supported a Bill, even if it came from the Government, if the principles were sound. This is also a subject which I feel should have come from the other side. On either side, there should be no exploitation.

With regard to the resolution itself I have already submitted that the principle of the resolution is not incorrect because in India only in a very few States the salary is Rs. 150 and that most of the States have raised it to Rs. 200, 250 or 300. Certain principles which are followed in England and America are followed in certain States. It is up to the Government to say whether they are able to raise it by Rs. 75 or 100. It is for them to say whether they are in a position to increase the salary consistent with their own policies. If they feel that they are not in a position to increase the salary looking to the other needs of society, I do not want to demand it, but if Government think that they can allow this increase in salary, we will certainly not oppose such a move. I leave it to the Government to say whether they are in a position to increase the salary or not.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise and will meet after half-an-hour.

The House adjourned for recess at Five Minutes past Ten of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty-five Minutes past Ten of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before we commence the proceedings I would like to answer the question that has been raised by my Hon'ble friend Sri V. S. Patil. He raised two points. The first point was whether the present motion has been given priority by ballot or by the Speaker's discretion. The second point was how today it could have some sort of precedence over other business. He wanted to know also when this resolution was tabled. I looked into the matter and found that it was tabled on the 18th. So far as the rule is concerned, I draw the attention of the Hon'ble Members to rule 28 (6) which reads as follows:

> "Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-rules (1) to (4) of this rule or in rule 133 the Speaker may on any day allotted for Private Members' business, give priority to any item of such business at the request of the member in charge."

I also draw the attention of Hon'ble Members to rule 150:

> "The Speaker may, after considering the state of business in the Assembly and in consultation with the Leader of the House, allot a day or days or part of a day for the discussion of any such motion."

I have taken action under these two rules.

†Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM (K.G.F.).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was taken by surprise when I heard the speech of the Hon'ble leader of the P. S. P. Group. All the while we on this side were thinking, as you correctly put it, that the Opposition should not differ in its views on a matter of great importance, but now, Sir, the Leader of the P. S. P. Group said that my friends from the Congress Party directly or indirectly instigated or asked a member from the Opposition to move this resolution. He means to say that that member has become a prey in the hands of the ruling party or the Government, but I want to put very clearly that Sri Sharan Gowda who has moved this resolution is as honest as any member of the P. S. P., if not more.

Sri M. RAMAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, he is making an incorrect statement. Sri Srinivas Shetty did not say that Sri Sharan Gowda was instigated by the ruling party to move this resolution.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—I will come to that point also. Mr. Speaker, if one is honest, he will always think that others are also honest.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA (Holenarasipur).—On a point of order. I submit that the member is competent only to speak on the subject. He cannot cast aspersion or comment on the speech delivered by any member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—(Addressing Sri Y. Veerappa,) He has a right to comment on the speech of other members.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Let us not waste the time of the House, Sir, by raising a point of order where there is no point of order. (*Laughter*)

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—On a point of order, Sir. Is he competent to say that there is no point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is nothing wrong in what Sri Arumugham says.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, the Leader of the Opposition group said in so far as Congress Party and the Government was concerned, 'Let us be honest'. I say the same thing with reference to the P. S. P. group. All the while we were considering ourselves as one with the P. S. P. group. Whenever they staged walk-outs, we also followed them. Mr. Speaker, the Congress talks of socialistic pattern of society, whereas the P.S.P. wants to work for the socialist society itself. Sir, the Leader of the P.S.P. group said that the pay of a Member of the Senate in America was very much high. He also said about U. K. He said that the M. Ps. there got a thousand rupees. In fact, you are the competent person to enlighten us on this, Sir, because you had been there: I do not think the P.S.P. group leader or any other member has gone to any of those places.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA (Channapatna).—Sir, he is saying that no

member of the P.S.P. visited any foreign country. I want to correct him.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, so far as my friend Sri Puttaramiya is concerned, I have seen in papers that he had gone to Bombay and not further. (*Loud laughter*). Sir, I only say, every member has got a right to bring in any resolution and express his own opinion. It is left to others to say whether they like it or dislike it.

Coming to the point, I would like to say that if you make the Members depend entirely on the income or salary, it is not possible for them to devote their full time for the constituencies. One of my friends this side suggested, 'why not give them permits or a licence?'. If this is the view of the P. S. P. group, I have no objection.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA.—Sir, I take objection to it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—(Addressing Sri C. M. Arumugham) Please correct yourself; it is not P.S.P. group; it is P.S.P. Party.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Sir, party is outside. Here, it is only P.S.P. opposition group. You are aware, Sir, in the Parliament, they are called groups only. We are 38 this side; they should not forget that, except for the fact that they have converted one or two from our side to their side. (*Laughter*) Sir, so far as the resolution is concerned, this disease has started from Bengal. It has gone to the Punjab; it has come down to Bombay and now it has come to Mysore. I hope, it will go to Madras and end in Kerala (*Loud laughter*). Now, Members are treated as equal to Gazetted cadre so far as signature is concerned. Of coure, there is the problem of N.G.Os. They say, Government is not adequately paying them for their maintenance, for the education of their childrsn, etc. Sir, so far as this increase in the salary of the Members is concerned, nobody, either on this side or the other side, dare say that they do not want it. Some of the Members on the other side are bus owners, permit owners and big land holders and they may not feel for this. In foreign countries, most of the Members of the Legislature are full—time workers. Here, some of them are business men, some of them are...

An HON'BLE MEMBER.—Lawyers.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Yes, lawyers; now they have become lawyers of Government than the Courts. (*Laughter*) Therefore, the best thing would be to make these people full-time workers. After all, whether it is P.S.P. or Congress, they must devote much of their time to their constituencies.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA (Tumkur).—Including yourself.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—Yes. They must devote more time to their constituencies instead of going for permits. (*Laughter*) Sir, in course of time, the P.S.P. should bring in a resolution that Members of the P.S.P. should have only so much of land and that they should not go for permits. Party discipline should be implemented in the Party itself. They can bring a resolution to increase the salary of N.G.Os. or they should have brought a resolution to increase the amenities of class IV servants of Government. When we consider the resolution before us, there will be criticism outside to the effect that because we are here as Members, we are doing all this for our own benefit. Absolutely not so. What I felt was, even among the P.S.P. Members, most of them are inclined to support Sri Sharan Gowda.

So far as the Congress Party is concerned, we cannot take whatever appears in the Paper, My friend was always telling "I have seen in the Papers." There is some yellow journalism which writes anything and everything. How can I take that as correct? Here, we are all members of this House. When the question of division comes, then only a distinction is made between Congress and other members. Otherwise, most of the members are more or less co-operating with each other. Even while discussing land reforms, the members on the other side used to come and tell us something; we agreed with them. It is not a question of that side or this side. I am not discussing the merit

(SRI C. M. ARUMUGHAM)

of the resolution, but I am not satisfied with the way in which the Leader of the Opposition handled the situation. He should not have said that.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—Whatever you say, we will never be provoked.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—If you are provoked you will lose the sympathy of 38 members on this side. We are not here under anybody's protection or guidance. Each member has got his own right and he is subject to the control of the supreme authority of this House, that is, the Hon'ble Speaker. Therefore, what I am trying to say is: "let the Leader of the P.S.P. say whether they are supporting or opposing." Now coming to the subject, I say, it is a national question so far as the payment of salaries to the members of the Legislature is concerned. It should be fixed on an all-India level. I am told that the Punjab has fixed at Rs. 250; Bombay has fixed at Rs. 250; Andhra is considering this question and Mysore is also considering Instead of making this disparity in the payment of salaries, to the Members. let the Parliament be empowered to fix the salaries of Members. If you feel like it, we can send even a resolution requesting the Parliament to amend the Constitution in that respect.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Parliament has no power but this House has the necessary power.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—The Constitution is there and the State Legislatures are eligible to fix their salary. But I want to point out that the defeated candidates of Legislature are getting Rs. 5,000 or Rs. 4,000. There is a feeling as to why the Legislators should get more. Sometimes they feel that it is better to contest and get defeated so that they may be absorbed in a better position and given better pay. The successful candidates are getting less. The Government must consider this aspect also. They must also consider whether it is desirable that defeated candidates should be appointed and made to get more pay. With these few remarks, I say that the Leader of the Opposition should not have dealt with the matter as he has done.

†Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, it is rather hard to speak on this motion because it comes from this side. Whether it comes from this side or that side, certain views have to be expressed and that is this: I feel that this is not the appropriate moment for taking a final decision on this particular motion. I am not speaking from the technical point of view as to whether the motion should be considered or not. That is not my point. I am only saying that this is not the right occasion and the proper time for us to pass a final judgment or for the Government to take a decision in regard to this matter. There may be many members in favour of this motion. Many members have spoken already and urged very strong grounds for increasing the salary. Whatever that be, I do not wish to go into those considerations. Purely as legislators, if you take only the income as legislators, we were so far within the ambit of income tax exemption. The moment the Bill in the form in which it appears is passed, we, who were within the exemption limit of income tax, would have to come within the purview of income tax authorities. I am very definite about it because the manner in which my friend moved here seems to suggest that it is an increase in salary and when it is an increase in salary, we will have to come within the income tax limit. We will have to undergo all that necessary process in the matter so that taking the over-all view into consideration, taking ever so many other aspects in the matter into consideration, I feel this is not an appropriate occasion. If the Government had felt very seriously about it, they should have brought it earlier in 1957 itself when we considered the question of uniform law applicable to various aspects. For example in 1957 itself, we had the amendment of Salaries and Allowances. At that stage, I believe, most of us on this side, including the Members of the Praja Socialist Party and including a large

number of independents, did make a suggestion that increased salary should not be asked. Being in the Opposition, we should not be inconsistent with the stand that we had taken in respect of this matter. We should not be looked upon as changing our views. As regards the point that a certain extraordinary situation has arisen, I feel nothing extraordinary has taken place which did not exist when this matter came up in 1957-58. I do not see any difference which warrants the salary to be increased. The same situation which obtained then obtains now. In view of that, I do not feel that it is correct for us to consider this matter.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—Sir on this issue the Government wants to remain neutral. The Government will not express its views either for or against. But looking to the trend of discussion so far it appears to me that nobody is prepared to oppose it except perhaps the Hon'ble Member Sri Narasimhan. Others want to keep silent. If I have understood Sri Narasimhan correctly, the trend of his speech, appears to be that he does not wish to support it. So, I will take into consideration the view-points of the House and the sense of the House will have to be considered by the Government. This is what I want to say. A word regarding the view-point expressed by my Hon'ble friend, the Member of the Opposition. All along he was trying to argue just like an advocate.

11 A.M.

He wanted perhaps to say 'Yes' for the Resolution and as he happened to be the Leader of the Opposition, he wanted to throw the blame on the Congress Party. He all along presumed that he was only honest and others might or might not be honest. Intelligence can be purchased, but not honesty. It is not the monopoly of any person to say that he is honest; others also can equally say that they are honest.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the present salary of Rs. 150 per mensem given to members of the Mysore Legislature being inadequate to meet the reasonable expenditure for carrying out their duties, this Assembly recommends to Government to take necessary action to amend the existing legislation and provide for payment of an additional amount of Rs. 100 a month and also to provide for free medical aid to the members of their family."

The motion was adopted.

NON-OFFICIAL BILL.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce the Bangalore City Tenants Protection Bill, 1959.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That leave to introduce the Bangalore City Tenants Protection Bill, 1959 be granted."

The motion was adopted

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Bill is introduced.

NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTION *re.* CHANGING THE NAME OF THE STATE FROM "MYSORE" TO "KARNATAK"

(Debate continued.)

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡಮೇಟಿ (ರೋಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿರುವ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಹೃತ್ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾದ ಸ್ವಾಗತವನ್ನು ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಾಗೂ ನನ್ನ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಬೆಂಬಲವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವು ಯಾವ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯಿಂದ ಬಂದಿದೆ, ಯಾವ ಪಕ್ಷದಿಂದ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ನಾನು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in Chair.]

ಈಗ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷದಿಂದ, ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯಿಂದ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣವಾಗತಕ್ಕದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗೆ, ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯವಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಎರಡು ಕೋಟಿ ಜನಾಂಗದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯಾಗಿದೆ ಯಾರೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ನೋವುಂಟಾಗದಂತೆ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿ ಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ